

REMARKS

The present filing is responsive to the Office Action.

Summary of the Response

Fig. 1 has been amended. Claim 4 has been amended. New claims 9-20 have been added. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application as amended are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-3 and 8¹ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yuichi (JP 2002-372711). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yuichi does not disclose the combination of structures recited in independent claim 1.

Claim 1 recites:

A backlight device comprising:

light guide means, having a pair of main surfaces faced each other and a pair of edge surfaces faced each other, for guiding the light from a light source arranged on one edge surface to both of main surfaces; and

control means for controlling said light source for illuminating a main lighting region having relatively large size on a side of one main surface through said light guide means, and illuminating a sub-lighting region having relatively small size on a side of another main surface through said light guide means.

¹ The Examiner erroneously included a claim 9 in the present rejection. Applicant believes the Examiner intended claim 8, and shall so respond accordingly.

Yuichi clearly does not teach the recited guiding light from a light source arranged on one edge surface (i.e., one of the pair of opposing edge surfaces recited in claim 1) to the lighting regions on both main surfaces for lighting liquid display panels. Further, Yuichi does not disclose the recited controller controlling a single light source to illuminate a main lighting region and a sub-lighting region on the respective main surfaces of the light guide. Instead, referring to Figs. 1 and 3 in Yuichi, it adopts two separate light sources, each arranged at an opposing edge surface of the light guide. Light from one light source on one edge surface is guided to top liquid crystal panel 108, and light from the other light source on another edge surface is guided to bottom liquid crystal panel 109. Accordingly, light is guided from two light sources to the respective top and bottom liquid crystal panels.

Accordingly, the Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation of claim 1 by Yuichi. Claim 1 and all its dependent claims are therefore patentable over Yuichi.

Further, the dependent claims add further limitations to further distinguish from Yuichi. For example, with respect to dependent claim 3, the switch means supplies the whole light source with the electric power in one mode of illumination, and supplies part of the light source with the electric power in another mode of illumination. Given that Yuichi makes use of two separate light sources on two edge surfaces for the liquid crystal panels, there would not be illumination by the whole light source in one mode and by the part of the light source in another mode.

It appears that in setting forth the basis for claim rejection, the Examiner merely quoted in verbatim the claim recitations, without identifying all the corresponding structures disclosed in Yuichi which are deemed to correspond to the recited structures in the claims. For example, the

Examiner did not identify which structure in Yuichi corresponds to the recited control means in claim 1. The Examiner referred item 108 in Yuichi to correspond to the recited control means, but item 108 is specifically identified as a liquid crystal panel, in particular the top liquid crystal panel.

Given that the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of anticipation (and obviousness for that matter), Applicant presumes that the Examiner had read and understood the Japanese version of Yuichi, before concluding that the recited structures in the claims have been disclosed by Yuichi. In which case, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to point out specific sections in the reference which are alleged to contain the anticipatory disclosures, so that Applicant can fully address the Examiner's specific allegations. Any lack of specificity in Yuichi should be resolved in Applicant's favor.

Should the Examiner reject the non-amended claims 1-3 and 8 based on a new ground of rejection in the next action, such action should not be made final, in order to allow Applicant a fair opportunity to more fully address such new ground of rejection with potential claim amendments as necessary.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirayama Yuichi (JP 2002-372711) in view of Im et al. (US 2006/0274226). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirayama Yuichi (JP 2002-372711) in view of Im et al. (US 2006/0274226) in view of West et al (US 2005/0001537). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirayama Yuichi (JP 2002-372711) in view of Hosseini et al. (US 2001/0001595). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Given the traversal of independent claim 1, the obviousness rejections of the dependent claims are rendered moot.

Further, Im does not make up for the deficiencies of Yuichi. Even if Im can somehow be combined with Yuichi, such combination would not obtain the present invention as defined by the claims.

Concerning claim 4, it has been amended to recite the LEDs (comprised in the light source) are arranged in parallel along said one edge surface along which the light source is arranged (as recited in claim 1). Given the recited light source is arranged along one edge surface in claim 1, it is only reasonable from a fair reading of claim 4 that the parallel arrangement of the LEDs refers to an arrangement of the LEDs along the same edge surface, as is also clear from the specification of the present application. This is, therefore, merely a clarifying amendment supported by the original disclosure of the present invention.

New Claims

New claims 9 to 20 have been added to round out the coverage of the present invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the new claims are not disclosed or rendered obvious by cited and applied references.

For example, new independent claims 9 and 19 recites a light guide having a first and second light emitting surfaces facing each other and a plurality of edge surfaces between the first and second light emitting surfaces, wherein the first light emitting surface emits light in a first lighting region that illuminates a first display, and the second light emitting surface emits light in a second lighting region that illuminates a second display, and wherein the first lighting region overlaps the second lighting region with respect to the first and second light emitting surfaces of

the light guide; and a light source positioned along one of said plurality of edge surfaces, wherein light from said light source is directed to the first lighting region and the second lighting region. Yuichi and Im, taken singly or in combination, do not disclose overlapping first lighting region and second lighting region, and directing light from a light source on one edge surface to both the first lighting region and second lighting region.

New dependent claims 13 and 20 further recites a controller controlling different amount of light from the light source to be emitted into the light guide, wherein the amount depends on whether light is desired to be emitted through the light guide to illuminate the first display or the second display. Yuichi and Im, taken singly or in combination, do not disclose the recited controller.

CONCLUSION

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending in this application are patentable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. **The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative to discuss any outstanding issues that may not have been adequately addressed in this response.**

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this transmittal and associated documents, or to credit any overpayment to **Deposit Account No. 501288** referencing the attorney docket number of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Wen Liu; Reg. No. 32,822/

Dated: August 5, 2009

Wen Liu
Registration No. 32,822

LIU & LIU
444 S. Flower Street; Suite 1750
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 830-5743
Facsimile: (213) 830-5741
Email: wliu@liulaw.com

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheet
Annotated Replacement Drawing Sheet